



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,590	05/16/2001	Shinji Fukasawa	010623	1417

23850 7590 04/14/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

QUACH, TUAN N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003


Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No. 09/855,590	Applicant(s) FUKASAWA, SHINJI	
	Examiner Tuan Quach	Art Unit 2814	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 10 February 2003 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:
- a) ☐ entered.
 - b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
 - c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.
 - d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.
 - e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

The amendment filed February 3, 2003 is filed subsequent to the Notice of Allowance and thus is treated as an amendment under 37 CFR 1.312. The amendment is not entered because the proposed changes in claims 1, 2, and 6 and the proposed new claims 22-30 change the scope of the claims. The amendment further does not fully and clearly state the reasons on which reliance is placed to show why the amendment is needed; why the proposed amended or new claims require no additional search or examination; why the claims are patentable; and why they were not earlier presented. Note that the amendment was not treated as a Preliminary Amendment since an RCE referred to on page 5 of the amendment is missing from the file; this was notified to applicant's attorney William Brook on March 28, 2003; to date no response regarding the missing RCE has been received, thus necessitating the treatment of the said amendment as a 312 amendment indicated above.


 Tuan Quach
 Primary Examiner